

# Village of Lombard

*Village Hall  
255 East Wilson Ave.  
Lombard, IL 60148  
villageoflombard.org*



## Minutes

**Monday, June 17, 2024**

**7:00 PM**

**Village Hall - Board Room**

## Plan Commission

*Leigh Giuliano, Chairperson*

*Commissioners:*

*Ruth Sweetser, Bill Johnston, Tony Invergo,*

*Alissa Verson and Robert Spreenber*

*Staff Liaison: Anna Papke*

## Call to Order

*Chairperson Giuliano called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m*

## Pledge of Allegiance

*Chairperson Giuliano led the Pledge of Allegiance*

## Roll Call of Members

**Present** 5 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Robert Spreenberg, and Alissa Verson

**Absent** 1 - Tony Invergo

*Also present: William Heniff, AICP, Director Community Development, Anna Papke, AICP, Planning & Zoning Manager Community Development, and Anne Skrodzki, Legal Counsel to the Plan Commission.*

*Chairperson Giuliano called the order of the agenda.*

*Ms. Papke read the Rules and Procedures as written by the Plan Commission.*

## Public Hearings

[240183](#)

### **PC 24-07: 1308-1330 S. Meyers Road - Pinnacle Single-Family Residential Planned Development (Continued from the June 3, 2024 Plan Commission Meeting)**

The petitioner requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property (1308-1330 S. Meyers Road), located within the Village of Lombard R1 Single-Family Residence District (1308 S. Meyers Road) and the DuPage County R-3 Single Family Residence District (1312-1330 S. Meyers Road) (cumulatively the “subject properties”):

1. Approve a Comprehensive Plan Map amendment for the subject properties from Estate Residential to Low Density Residential;
2. For the property at 1308 S. Meyers Road, approve a map amendment to rezone the property from the R1 Single-Family Residence District to the R2 Single-Family Residence District;

3. For the properties located at 1312-1330 S. Meyers Road, in conjunction with a request for approval of an annexation agreement and annexation into the corporate limits of the Village of Lombard, upon annexation, approve a map amendment to rezone the property from the R0 Single-Family Residence District to the R2 Single-Family Residence District;
4. Pursuant to Section 155.407(C) of Village Code, establish a new planned development for the subject properties to provide for development of 24 detached single-family residences, including relief from the following standards, as set forth more fully as follows:
  - a. Pursuant to Section 155.407(G)(2) of Village Code, approve a conditional use for building height not to exceed 38 feet or three stories;
  - b. Approve the following deviations and variations from Chapter 155 of Village Code (the Zoning Ordinance):
    - i. Pursuant to Section 155.407(D), a deviation in order to allow a development with a density of 6.14 dwelling units per acre where a density of 5.8 dwelling units per acre is allowed within the areas of Lots 1-24 and Outlot A as depicted in the Planned Development Site Plan (this will allow 24 dwelling units where 22.7 dwelling units are allowed, or 106% of the allowed density in the R2 District);
    - ii. Pursuant to Section 155.407(E), which requires a minimum lot width of 60 feet, deviations in order to allow individual lot widths less than 60 feet as depicted in the Planned Development Site Plan;
    - iii. Pursuant to Section 155.407(F)(1)(a)(iv), which requires a front yard of 30 feet, deviations in order to allow front yards of 20 feet on Lots 1-6 and 24 feet on Lots 7-24, as provided for in the Planned Development Site Plan and proposed preliminary plat of subdivision;
    - iv. Pursuant to Section 155.407(F)(2), which requires a corner side yard of 20 feet, deviations in order to allow corner side yards of one (1) foot on Lot 7 and Lot 24, as provided for in the

Planned Development Site Plan;

- v. Pursuant to Section 155.407(F)(3), which requires an interior side yard of six (6) feet, deviations in order to allow interior side yards of three (3) feet (eaves of two (2) feet not closer than one (1) foot from the lot line) on all lots, as provided for in the Planned Development Site Plan;
  - vi. Pursuant to Sections 155.510(A)(1) and Section 155.407(H), deviations in order to allow open space to be calculated across all parcels in the planned development rather than on a parcel-by-parcel basis, and to allow a development with 39% open space where 50% open space is required;
  - vii. Pursuant to Section 155.210 and 155.210(A)(2)(b), a variation in order to allow an above-ground utility cabinet before the principal building and allow the cabinet in front of the south and east walls of the building on Lot 6;
  - viii. Pursuant to Section 155.205(A)(1)(c), a variation in order to allow, as shown in the Landscape Plan and Planned Development Fence Plan, a 6-foot fence on Outlot A at all locations (a portion of the north fence extends along the abutting front yard to the north) except near the Meyers Road and 14th Street driveways where a 4-foot fence is depicted;
  - ix. Pursuant to Section 155.711, variations in order to allow innovative landscaping per the submitted Landscape Plan;
- c. Approve the following variations from Chapter 154 of Village Code (the Subdivisions and Development Ordinance):
- i. Pursuant to Section 154.304(D)(2) and Section 154.306(D)(2), variations in order to allow public improvements to the School Street and 14th Street rights-of-way depicted in the preliminary engineering plan, Planned

Development Site Plan and Landscape Plan, as determined upon hearing and decision;

- ii. Pursuant to Section 154.304(D)(3), Section 154.306(D)(3) and Section 154.309, variations in order to allow improvements to the Meyers Road right-of-way depicted in the preliminary engineering plan, Planned Development Site Plan and Landscape Plan, as determined upon hearing and decision;
  - iii. Pursuant to Section 154.407(A) and Section 154.503(D), variations in order to continue the existing widths of all abutting rights-of-way and pavement widths thereof;
  - iv. Pursuant to Section 154.506(D), variations in order to permit 24 lots with frontage on the private streets within the subdivision;
  - v. Pursuant to Section 154.510 and Section 150.301, variations in order to permit the driveways onto Meyers Road and onto 14th Street as depicted in the preliminary engineering plans and Planned Development Site Plan provided that the gate shall remain operable to allow entry by all vehicles without access control so as not to stack vehicles over the sidewalk or cause backing movements;
  - vi. Such other variations from Chapter 154, including those which exclude final landscape treatment from public improvements required to be completed prior to the initiation of the final ten percent (10%) of units but only to the extent required on lots that have not been certified for occupancy, as deemed necessary and appropriate;
- d. Approve the following deviation from Chapter 153 of Village Code (the Sign Ordinance):
- i. Pursuant to Section 153.232(B), a deviation in order to allow each subdivision sign at a height of six (6) feet, where a height of four (4) feet is permitted; and

5. Approve a preliminary plat of subdivision pursuant to Section 154.203(D).

**June 17, 2024**

*(Commissioners Spreenberg, Sweetser, Johnson, Verson, and Chair Giuliano present)*

*Chair Giuliano announced the proceedings for PC 24-07, which was a continuation of the proceedings from the June 3, 2024, meeting. She said the public hearing portion of the proceedings had been completed on June 3, and the proceedings this evening would resume at Plan Commissioner discussion.*

*Attorney Skrodzki re-swore in the witnesses.*

*Commissioners Verson and Johnston stated that they had each watched the proceedings of the June 3, 2024, meeting and were prepared to engage in Commissioner discussion.*

*Commissioner Spreenberg asked about the request for a conditional use for peak roof heights of 38 feet. He asked if there are other developments in the Village that have requested this type of entitlement. Ms. Papke said R2 allows heights of greater than 30 feet as a conditional use, but staff is not aware of any petitions seeking that conditional use in the R2 District. However, there are other residential districts where allowable height is greater than 30 feet. The single-family residential development at Park and Grove includes houses with peak heights of around 37 feet. Those houses did not require zoning relief for height because the underlying district on that property permits higher buildings than does the R2 District. She noted that the Park and Grove development shares a number of other similarities to the development proposed for the subject property.*

*Commissioner Johnston asked if the proposed density on the subject property was unique or if there were other examples in the Village, and had that increased density caused any issues. Ms. Papke said the development at Park and Grove had received variances for lot area, which is effectively a variance for density. To staff's knowledge, the development was functioning well.*

*Commissioner Johnston asked if the Park and Grove development had caused any traffic impacts. Ms. Papke said staff was not aware of any traffic impacts.*

*Commissioner Johnston asked Mr. Millan about the KLOA report. He asked about the finding that the development would increase traffic*

volume by 1%. Mr. Millan said this is correct. KLOA had looked at traffic counts during peak hours throughout the day. He said the development would not have a significant impact on traffic flow in the area on a normal daily basis. He said the analysis had accounted for the presence of the elementary school.

Commissioner Johnston asked if the development would necessitate the school changing traffic patterns during pickup/drop off. Mr. Millan said the KLOA analysis had not indicated the need to change traffic patterns for the school.

Commissioner Johnston asked the petitioner about snow removal plans. Mr. Daniel said the HOA will maintain exterior areas and will be responsible for snow removal. There will be areas to set snow aside. During a large storm, the snow would be hauled off site.

Commissioner Johnston asked about Mr. Daniel's discussion with the school district. Mr. Daniel said the school district had indicated no plans for altering traffic patterns around the school. He described some of his observations of traffic patterns around the school.

Commissioner Johnston asked if the school district had comments on sidewalks and lights. Mr. Daniel said the school district had not expressed any concerns.

Commissioner Johnston asked about the design of the perimeter fence. Mr. Daniel said it will be a six-foot solid fence around the majority of the development. The fence will drop to four feet in height around the driveways. Fences near the driveways will be metal. In response to additional questions from Commissioner Johnston, Mr. Syed added that the solid fence is a wood plastic composite that will maintain its look over time.

Commissioner Johnston asked if the fence would dampen sound. Mr. Syed said he expected the fence would have some dampening effect on sound.

Commissioner Johnston asked about guest parking for parties and whether the school allowed guest parking on the school parking lot. He noted that people generally do have guests park in the public street when they hold parties or gatherings. Mr. Daniel said there were perpendicular parking spaces on 14th Street in the right-of-way in front of the school that could be used. He did not expect there would be any need to park on the school property, and noted this would not be possible without permission from the school district.

Commissioner Sweetser asked whether some of the issues raised by

*the public could still be addressed. She noted there had been comments about noise from the rooftop decks. Was there an opportunity to change the plans to address these concerns. Ms. Papke said she could not speak to what changes the petitioner may be willing to consider, though the Commissioners could address those questions to the petitioner directly. She noted that when petitions are brought before the Plan Commission, they are submitted as a fully formulated plan, and the Plan Commission is generally tasked with reviewing the petition as presented.*

*Commissioner Sweetser said making changes to the petition did not seem to be a simple thing given comments during the last meeting. Ms. Papke said that the Plan Commission could not entertain changes to the submitted plans that would require a zoning entitlement that had not been previously advertised. Even changes that would not require re-advertisement were best avoided as there would not have been time for staff or the public to review such changes. Occasionally petitioners offered small changes based on an issue that was identified during public comment. Generally, however, staff recommended the Plan Commission consider the plans as submitted.*

*Commissioner Sweetser said there had been a lot of public comment about noise from balconies, and would it be possible to address these concerns at this point. Mr. Daniel said the petitioner had made changes to the barrier surrounding the rooftop decks in response to comments received at the neighborhood meeting. They now proposed a six-foot high barrier around the decks. He noted there would be landscaping that would further mitigate sound.*

*Mr. Heniff said noise from single-family homes is regulated by distancing requirements for AC units and other improvements within the Zoning Ordinance. He said many times excessive noise from AC units is a maintenance issue. He said there is always some noise in single-family neighborhoods, which is to be expected. The Village does have nuisance provisions that would be applied if noise exceeded typical levels expected from a single-family home.*

*Commissioner Spreenberg asked if the internal drive counts toward the open space requirement. Ms. Papke said the drive does not count as open space.*

*Commissioner Spreenberg asked if the Zoning Ordinance was concerned with the setup of a homeowners' association. Ms. Papke said the Zoning Ordinance does not speak to whether an HOA is required, nor to what elements of a development might be controlled by an HOA.*



*Commissioner Spreenberg asked if the interior drive will be permeable pavers and would that impact stormwater design. Mr. Lin said the development team had not determined if the drive would be permeable, but the development would meet stormwater requirements in any event.*

*Mr. Heniff said that HOAs are not uncommon in Lombard. Stormwater detention facilities are often maintained by HOAs. HOAs may also maintain other elements of the development. If the HOA fails to maintain any element under its control, the Village's property maintenance codes would be applied to the HOA.*

*Commissioner Spreenberg asked about the reason for having an internal drive and limited curb cuts on School. Mr. Daniel said this design choice was made in response to neighborhood preferences for limited curb cuts on School Street.*

*Commissioner Spreenberg asked if there were other neighborhoods in Lombard with gates similar to the petitioner's proposed plan, and did staff foresee any issues with the gates. Ms. Papke said there were not any gated communities in the Village at present. However, the Village's emergency service personnel are familiar with the technology of such gates and how they operate to allow access in case of an emergency. There are also other communities nearby that have gated communities, so the concept is familiar to both emergency service personnel and residents. She noted that the development cannot create a traffic impact to adjacent roads. If in the future it was determined that the presence of the gates was creating a backup or other traffic impact on 14th Street or Meyers Road, the Village (14th Street) or DuPage County (Meyers Road) would have the authority to require the property owner to make changes to the gate to mitigate those impacts.*

*Commissioner Spreenberg asked the petitioner why the gate was part of the design. Mr. Daniel said the gate would create a sense of security and affect value. He said the gate will accept all traffic in.*

*Commissioner Johnston asked if the gate will be activated by a car approaching, and someone would be able to exit if they accidentally drive into the development. Mr. Daniel said this is correct. Commissioner Johnston asked if there will be cameras at the gates. Mr. Daniel said there may be cameras.*

*Commissioner Sweetser asked Mr. Daniel to speak to the issue of overflow parking and how that would be handled. Mr. Daniel said there would be six parking spaces per unit. He said there may be provisions for temporary extra parking internally on the private drive, which would*

*be controlled by the HOA and would not affect public streets. He said that residents may rely on informal arrangements with neighbors to allow temporary parking for guests in neighboring driveways. He noted the parking spaces on 14th Street as a potential option for overflow parking. He said there could be parking on the east side of School Street. He did not think this would be a common occurrence. He said the developer had contemplated having a parking lot and club house at the south end of the development, but this had not been supported by the neighbors.*

*Commissioner Sweetser said it was impossible to anticipate every scenario that might arise that could affect parking. Mr. Daniel said this was true of any single-family home. He said there were plenty of alternatives in the area if someone were to have a party in the future.*

*Mr. Heniff noted that the proposed houses would have two car garages plus room for up to four cars in the driveway. This exceeded the number of cars that could fit into many driveways of single-family homes in the Village.*

*Commissioner Sweetser said it was nice to have an alternative in mind in the event that additional parking was needed.*

*Mr. Heniff noted for the record the School Street does not have parking restrictions aside from restrictions around intersections and fire hydrants.*

*Commissioner Spreenberg asked about the requested front yard setbacks and would those apply to the perimeter of the development or the interior. Ms. Papke said the front yard is the lot line adjacent to the internal private drive. The requested deviations are related to that property line. All setbacks to the perimeter of the development meet or exceed code requirements.*

*Commissioner Spreenberg said the development was denser than normal but not exceptionally so. He said the buildings were tall but not creeping up onto the rights-of-way.*

*Commissioner Sweetser asked about snow removal plans. Mr. Daniel said snow removal would be delineated in the HOA documents. The HOA would be responsible. Mr. Daniel identified some possible stacking areas for snow within the development.*

*Chair Giuliano asked if the garbage removal would be handled similarly to snow removal, with no centralized location. Mr. Daniel said this is correct. Cans will be wheeled out to the ends of each driveway.*

*Commissioner Verson said it had been interesting to hear about the various revisions that the petitioner had completed in order to arrive at the proposed plan.*

*Commissioner Johnston said he would not want to see this type of development in the middle of a park property or other low-density development. However, he felt this was an appropriate development on the subject property because it is located on a major four lane roadway.*

*Commissioner Spreenberg said the Plan Commission had previously discussed the possibility of allowing more density on Westmore Meyers Road, but trying to eliminate the number of curb cuts.*

**On a motion by Commissioner Johnston, and a second by Commissioner Verson, the Plan Commission voted 5-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 24-07 subject to the four (4) conditions in the staff report:**

- 1. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report;**
- 2. That the petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with the plans submitted as part of this petition and referenced in the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report, except as they may be changed to conform to Village Code;**
- 3. That the petitioner shall apply for and receive building permits for the proposed improvements; and**
- 4. That this approval shall be subject to the commencement time provisions as set forth within Section 155.103(F)(11).**

**Mr. Heniff said that the petition would tentatively be scheduled for Village Board consideration on August 15, 2024. Attorney Skrodzki noted Village Board agendas are available online.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Robert Spreenberg, and Alissa Verson

**Absent:** 1 - Tony Invergo

## **Business Meeting**

### **Approval of Minutes**

The minute approval was continued to the next Plan Commission

Meeting.

## **Public Participation**

*Carl Gonzalez said he moved from a place that was congested and bought a house on one acre of land. He said he had observed a lot of traffic, especially around holidays. He was concerned about spillover of traffic from the development proposed with PC 24-07. He said there would not be enough parking if residents had gatherings. He was concerned about noise from air conditioning units.*

*Joe Purkhart said he lived on La Londe Avenue and had lived in Lombard for four years. He had previously lived in York Center and in other cities. He was disappointed in the Plan Commission's recommendation for approval of PC 24-07. He said the Plan Commission had justified the approval by stating that the development was on the edge of Lombard. He did not agree with this justification.*

*Janette Villaus said the development proposed in PC 24-07 does not fit with the surrounding neighborhood.*

## **DuPage County Hearings**

There were no DuPage County Hearings

## **Chairperson's Report**

There was no Chairperson's Report.

## **Planner's Report**

There was no Planner's Report.

## **Unfinished Business**

There was no Unfinished Business.

## **New Business**

There was no New Business

## **Subdivision Reports**

There were no Subdivision Reports

## **Site Plan Approvals**

There are no Site Plan Approvals

## **Workshops**

There are no Workshops

## **Adjournment**

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnston, seconded by Commissioner Verson, to adjourn the meeting at 8:04 p.m. The motion passed by an unanimous vote.